

Volume 23

PROCESSED

OCT 31 2001

GTU LIBRARY



July 2001

# IRISH BIBLICAL STUDIES

## **Editor:**

**REV PROFESSOR J. C. McCULLOUGH**  
Union Theological College  
26 College Green, Belfast BT7 1LN  
Fax: [44] 028 90 20 50 81  
Email: jc.mccullough@union.ac.uk

## **Associate Editor:**

**REV. PROFESSOR ERNEST BEST**  
13 Newmill Gardens  
St. Andrews KT16 8RY

## **Assistant Editor:**

**MRS SANDRA MCKINNEY**  
Union Theological College  
26 College Green, Belfast BT7 1LN

## **Editorial Advisory Panel:**

**REV. PAUL FLEMING**  
**REV. PRINCIPAL JAMES HAIRE**  
**REV. DR. DAVID HILL**  
**REV. D. P. KER**  
**DR. J.G. McCONVILLE**  
**REV. DR. R.J. MCKELVEY**  
**PROFESSOR E. NICHOLSON**  
**REV. PROFESSOR J. C. O'NEILL**  
**MR DAVID PAYNE**

## **Subscriptions:**

**Individuals:** £9.00 Sterling  
**Institutions:** £14.00 Sterling or \$30.00 US

All subscriptions should be made payable to:  
**"Irish Biblical Studies"** and addressed to the Editor.

---

# IRISH BIBLICAL STUDIES

**VOLUME 23, JUNE 2001**

## CONTENTS

Robert B. Salters	<b>The Unity of Lamentations</b>	101-110
Gordon Campbell	<b>How to say what. Story and interpretation in the Book of Revelation</b>	111-134

## Book Reviews

*The Essential IVP Reference Collection.* (Leicester: IVP, 2001. £99.99). [J. C. McCullough]; Wells, Ronald A, *People behind the Peace. Community and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999) [James Burnett]; *Becoming and Being. The Doctrine of God in Charles Hartshorne and Karl Barth.* Colin E. Gunton, SCM Press, 2nd edition, 2001. [John Thompson].

135-144

## THE UNITY OF LAMENTATIONS

*Robert B. Salters*

---

A number of features in Lamentations support the view that the five individual chapters belong together. However, as early as the ancient Versions, there is an awareness that the genre is not the same throughout, and that the assumed unity needs some qualification. The phenomenon of the imitation of some features, seen in the Tisha b'ab prayers, was probably at work as the book took shape.

Is the book of Lamentations a unit in the way the Book of Ruth or Song of Songs are units, or is it like the Book of Psalms, a collection of pieces each of which had an originally independent existence?

While the book was believed to be the work of Jeremiah, the question of unity was not of great interest to a commentator, but once scholars could shake off the fetters of that tradition the way was open to subject the book to thorough investigation. And, strange as it may seem, they are not all in agreement!

But while the abandonment of the view that Jeremiah was the author did change the attitude towards unity and integrity, some translators and commentators, within the history of interpretation, were already aware that it was not all of a piece, that there was diversity here. The superscription in the LXX

καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τὸ αἰχμαλωτισθῆναι τὸν Ισραὴλ καὶ Ιερουσαλῆμ ἐρημωθῆναι ἐκάθισεν Ιερεμίας κλαίων καὶ ἐθρήνησεν τὸν θρῆνον τοῦτον ἐπὶ Ιερουσαλῆμ καὶ εἶπεν

refers to τὸν θρῆνον τοῦτον “this lament”<sup>1</sup>, and scholars have taken this to refer to the whole of the book, in spite of the fact that that the

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Vulgate's superscription which refers to “lamentationem hanc”

title in both Versions is plural - *Θρῆνοι* and *Lamentationes* - both of which may be interpreted as implying a plurality of a particular genre. The same could be said of the references to the book in Jewish literature where, in addition to the title אֲכַח *echah*,<sup>2</sup> it is called<sup>3</sup> קִנּוֹת *qinot*, i.e. a collection of the genre קִנָּה *qinah*.

It is surely clear from this text that there are several units within the corpus; and the extent of them is confirmed in some MSS of the Peshitta where, after the title "Lamentations of Jeremiah", we get subtitles: First lament, second lament etc. Again, the Masoretic division of the text - where the paragraph marker פֵּ *peh* is placed after each acrostic, is in accordance with the Peshitta divisions. When, in the 15<sup>th</sup> century, the Bible was divided into chapters, the divisions coincided with that of the Masoretes. Indeed, while one might detect divisions within the five chapters, the presence of the alphabetic acrostics ensured that Lamentations was the easiest book in the Bible to divide.

However, it is one thing to find that the text divides easily, and quite another to conclude that the various parts belong together. That there may have been some dispute as to the homogeneity of the five chapters is reflected already in the Versions, for while most Versions' titles tally with that of the LXX, i.e. Laments or *qinot*, the fifth poem, in Peshitta and Vulgate, is entitled "A Prayer of Jeremiah". This shows that some were of the opinion that not all the poems could be classified as *qinot*. It is important to note this.

In connection with unity we might also mention some remarks by Rashi. Rashi regards Jeremiah as the author of the book, but he says that it had originally contained three alphabetics והיו שלש ביזה (which he identifies, by their first words, as chapters 1, 2 and 4), and that that book was burned by Jehoiakim. Later, there

---

<sup>2</sup>The heading in many Hebrew MSS and in the Hebrew Bible.

<sup>3</sup>In b. B. Bat. 14b

were added three more alphabetics which he identifies as chapter 3 (the triple acrostic), adding the phrase, "three corresponds to three". It may be that Rashi is just giving a fanciful exegesis<sup>4</sup> of Jer 36:32 which reads: "Then Jeremiah took another roll and gave it to Baruch, the scribe, the son of Neriah; and he wrote in it from the mouth of Jeremiah all the words of the book which Jehoiakim, king of Judah had burned in the fire; and *there were added to them many like words*"; but his comments lead us to the conclusion that he perceived some differences between the corpus comprising Chapters 1, 2 and 4, and Chapter 3. It is also interesting to note here that Rashi does not even mention Chapter 5!

At first glance Lamentations appears to be a self-contained document, being four complete alphabetic acrostics followed by a chapter of twenty-two verses all, possibly, with the historical background of the fall of Jerusalem in 586 BCE. But Chapter 5 differs from the rest of Lamentations in three important respects: a) it is not an acrostic (though it does have 22 lines). b) it has a different poetic metre (3/3 rather than 3/2). c) it resembles, *in form*, the communal laments in the Book of Psalms, whereas the others do not. It has even been suggested<sup>5</sup> that, while Chapters 1-4 originated shortly after 586 BCE, Chapter 5 comes from a period as late as the Maccabees.

As I have already noted, the difference between Chapter 5 and the other chapters was noticed at least as far back as the Peshitta Version. I suspect that this observation was based on the *form* of the poem rather than on the fact that it is not an acrostic and that its metre is different from that of the others. It does not, however, follow that a different form means a different origin in that, as some scholars argue, the final chapter, being a prayer, may round off the composition as a whole; but it occurred to me that an examination

---

<sup>4</sup>A. J. Rosenberg, *The Five Megilloth*, Vol. II (New York: The Judaic Press, 1992), 1.

<sup>5</sup>S. A. Fries, "Parallele zwischen den Klageliedern Cap. IV, V und der Maccabäerzeit," *ZAW* 13 (1893): 110-124; S. T. Lachs, "The Date of Lamentations V," *JQR* n.s. 57 (1966-67): 48.

of the vocabulary employed by the authors would be enlightening, on the question of unity.

It would be surprising if, in comparing any poem in the Hebrew Bible with another in the same corpus, there was no overlap whatsoever. Hebrew has not such a vast vocabulary that a writer could compose even a small piece without drawing on words which crop up elsewhere time and again. Even if set the task of writing a poem and avoiding the vocabulary of another poem it would not be easy. Consequently, when we compare the vocabulary of the poems which comprise the Book of Lamentations, we should not be surprised if vocabulary in one poem is to be found in another, or throughout the book. While other arguments may be employed to support the unity of the book, one based on vocabulary - though important - should not be pushed too hard. And yet, while the vocabulary of, say, Chapter 1 is to be found in some of the other poems and vice versa, there are some observations which may be significant in this regard.

If we take Chapter 5, the poem highlighted by Peshitta and Vulgate as having a different genre from the other poems, and note its vocabulary, we find that it has very clear affinities with the previous poems. Indeed, we get the impression that the writer of Chapter 5 was drawing on the other poems for his material. This is so to such an extent that one can rule out the notion that Chapter 5 is a completely independent poem tacked on to the end of four acrostics. There are, of course, features which are unique to Chapter 5. It is the only chapter that mentions Egypt and Assyria, the only place where the invading enemy is referred to as strangers and foreigners, contains the only specific reference to the sins of the fathers; and there are some twenty other terms which are not found elsewhere in Lamentations. But given the fact that the *form* of Chapter 5 is quite unique in the book, it is remarkable how often the words used reflect previous chapters.

To begin with, 5:1 requests Yahweh to "remember", picking up the statement in 2:1 that Yahweh has *not* remembered, and requesting a reversal of that situation (cf. 5:20). The writer also beseeches Yahweh to "look and see", terminology which is an echo of

1:9,11,18, 20; 2:20; 3:63.

The root נִפְלָא (Niphal) is found at 1:20, and the Qal passive participle at 4:6. At v. 3 the phrase “like widows” brings to mind the simile at 1:1. The verb נִפְלָא used of the enemy pursuing at v. 5, is used in a similar fashion at 1:3, 6; 4:19. The word צוֹאָר (neck) is found also at 1:14. The verb אָתָה (to sin) at vv. 7, 16 reflects 1:8; 3:39. The noun עַזָּה (iniquity) at v. 7 is an echo of 2:14; 4:6, 13, 22. חַמָּה is mentioned at vv. 6, 9 and also at 1:11; 4:4; and the reference to מְדֻבָּר at v. 9 reflects its use at 4:19. Again, רַבָּח (sword) at v. 9 seems to echo 1:20; 2:21; 4:9, as does רַעַב (famine) v. 10 which is referred to at 2:19; 4:9. The word אִשָּׁה (woman) is mentioned at 2:20 and 4:10 as well as at 5:11; שָׁרֶת at 1:6; 2:2, 9 in addition to 5:12; יְמִין at 1:19; 2:10, 21; 4:16 as well as at 5:12, 14; שָׁמֶן at 2:21 and at 5:13; בְּחֹור at 1:15, 18; 2:21 and at 5:13, 14.

There are other examples, but enough have been listed to make it clear that Chapter 5 was not written in isolation but is closely connected with what precedes. Chapter 5 belongs in the Lamentations corpus.

Having said that, however, it should be noted that Chapter 5’s relationship with Chapter 3 is anything but strong with regard to vocabulary. Most of the vocabulary of Chapter 5 is reflected in Chapters 1, 2 and 4; few words in Chapter 5 are echoed by Chapter 3.

If, as some have argued, Chapter 5 is the prayer which sums up the other poems, why does the author of Chapter 5 find little or no space for the vocabulary of Chapter 3? Could it be that the author of Chapter 5 did not have Chapter 3 to draw on?

This raises the question of the place of Chapter 3 in the corpus; and when one discovers that terms such as Zion, Jerusalem, Judah and Israel are absent from Chapter 3, the latter comes under further

suspicion. After all, are not all five chapters concerned with the Fall of Jerusalem and its aftermath?<sup>6</sup>

The fact that Chapters 1, 2 and 4 begin in identical fashion (with אַיִלָּה), and that each stanza in these chapters begins with successive letters of the alphabet, would lead us to conclude that some kind of unity exists here; and when we find that Chapter 5 appears to be closely related to these poems, with regard to vocabulary, we are inclined to the view that Chapter 5 belongs here too; and that it was probably composed after Chapters 1, 2 and 4. The fact that the vocabulary of Chapter 3 is seldom reflected in Chapter 5 may lead us to the conclusion that Chapter 3 was the last poem to be written<sup>7</sup>.

I am not arguing that Chapter 3 does not belong with the others. The fact that that it, too, is an alphabetic acrostic, though of a more intense variety than Chapters 1, 2 and 4, makes it likely that its home lies with them. Again, the metre employed in Chapter 3 matches that of the metre of 1, 2 and 4; and it does have other important links with those chapters: 3:48 “My eyes run with streams of water because of my people’s downfall” is strikingly similar to 2:11 “My eyes are blinded with tears . . . . because of my people’s downfall”, the phrase “he bent his bow” occurs in both 2:4 and 3:12, while the suffix on עברחו 3:1 has no referent except one assumes the presence of another passage, such as 2:22.

The Jewish commemoration of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple (587 BCE and 70 CE) takes place annually on the 9<sup>th</sup> of Ab. That it is a very ancient custom is confirmed by references to it in rabbinic writings *y. Šabb.* 16: 15c; *Lev. Rab.* 15:4. It would, however, seem strange if the commemoration of such momentous events should have begun as late as Talmudic times. It is more likely that mourning and lamentation for the destruction of

---

<sup>6</sup>Perhaps not, but that is the traditional interpretation; cf. R. B. Salters, *Jonah and Lamentations* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1994 ), 76-83.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. C. Westermann, *Lamentations*, Edinburgh: T & T Clark (1994), 193.

Jerusalem and the Temple will have begun shortly after 586 BCE in some form or other. Zech 7.3-5 refers to mourning and fasting in the 5<sup>th</sup> month (Ab) and implies that this had been customary for the previous seventy years. These allusions may indeed refer to an early commemoration of the Fall of Jerusalem. Central to this observance is the reading of the book of Lamentations, but afterwards there are many prayers, some called *qinot*, which have accumulated over the centuries<sup>8</sup>. These prayers often strike the same mood as that of Lamentations and indeed receive their inspiration from that text. The alphabetic structures seemed to appeal to author after author of those prayers, so that, for example, we have one where a first line may begin with a letter of the alphabet, and much more sophisticated ones where, for example, every stanza begins with the word *echah*, the first strophe of the first stanza has five *alephs*, the second strophe six *beths*; the first strophe of the second stanza has five *gimmels*, the second strophe six *daleths* etc. Another prayer has a double alphabetic form commencing with the first two words of each stanza. The first word is taken from the twenty-two verses of Lam 2, and the second is counter-alphabetical<sup>9</sup>.

What has happened is that the material for commemorating the fall of Jerusalem has grown over the centuries, some of the vocabulary has been re-used, and the alphabetic acrostic has been imitated and intensified to a greater or lesser degree.

Although one cannot prove it, this quasi imitation was probably at work in the growth of the book of Lamentations. Beginning with Chapter 1, in itself a sophisticated composition and probably created for the 9<sup>th</sup> of Ab commemoration, Chapter 2 followed, imitating the metre, the mood and the acrostic pattern, but adding clear references

---

<sup>8</sup>See A. Rosenfeld, *Tisha B'Ab Compendium*, (New York: The Judaica Press, 1986)

<sup>9</sup>i.e. the first word of the first line begins with an *א* and the second with a *ב*; the first word of the second line begins with a *כ*, and the second word with a *ו*. See Rosenfeld, *op. cit.* 96.

to the Temple. Chapter 4 then took up the same mood, metre and acrostic pattern, but varying it somewhat with a two-line stanza and a little more down to earth. It could be that these three poems are the work of one person, though it could be that the similarities are really the result of imitation, but they give the impression of having been written by a poet (or poets) who witnessed the scenes described. If these poems were written for the purpose of the commemoration of the Fall of Jerusalem, it may be that prayers were also offered. The prayer which we encounter at Chapter 5 may not, therefore, be as early as Chapters 1, 2 and 4, but here too we have semblance of imitation - the extensive use of the vocabulary of Chapters 1, 2 and 4 and the twenty-two lines, echoing the alphabetic acrostics of the other three chapters.

Finally, and at a later date - possibly after the restoration of the Temple in the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE, the author of Chapter 3 composed his poem. Again, he imitated his predecessors in the area of metre and acrostic, outshining them in the latter. It may be that this author was the redactor of the book, as we have it. If so, the placing of this poem at the centre of the document may be his way of putting his stamp on the corpus. We should note that the characteristics of Chapters 1, 2 and 4, mixing features of *qinah* and prayer are absent from Chapter 3. We should also note that this author does not give the impression of having been an eye-witness to the aftermath of 586 BCE; indeed, he does not even mention Jerusalem, Zion, Judah or Israel! We should also note that the genre in Chapter 3 is not consistent: it begins and ends with individual lament style and incorporates bits of communal laments. But the really important difference is the section vv. 26-41 which is didactic in character. The author, focussing on personal suffering, calls for perseverance, confession of sins and return to God. It would seem from this section that he would frown upon the call to lament (2:18). We must remember that he was not tampering with scripture: he was, possibly, revising a piece of liturgy. He wanted to influence the service on the 9<sup>th</sup> of Ab towards a more philosophical approach to suffering. The Temple had been restored, after all, and the exile was over. He was of the opinion that the commemoration was unbalanced and that the subject of how to deal with suffering,

present suffering, was something to be addressed.

Robert B Salters  
University of St Andrews

## How to say what. Story and interpretation in the Book of Revelation.

Gordon Campbell

---

Three recent approaches to the story Revelation tells attempt to hunt it down (Alan Garrow),<sup>1</sup> to explore and retell it (David Barr),<sup>2</sup> or to analyse its component parts (James Resseguie).<sup>3</sup> These studies are noteworthy not least because, in making their contribution, all three self-consciously ask *how to say what*, in other words, their proposals offer not just content but reflection on method. This article: 1. briefly surveys past answers to the question *what is Revelation about* from the point of view of the methods employed, hinting that a careful eclecticism is needed; 2. then considers the problem of hermeneutical adequacy (as illustrated by three particular interpretative questions) and highlights the issue of Revelation's unity; 3. finally, the second half of the article examines precisely *how* each selected author conducts a whole-text reading of Revelation, offers an evaluation of their work and makes some suggestions about a way forward for interpretation.

The Book of Revelation has to be getting at something. For all its obscurities the flood of recent books about the Apocalypse in English show that the book is still considered to have meaning

---

<sup>1</sup> A.J.P. Garrow, *Revelation* [NTR] (London, 1997)

<sup>2</sup> D.L. Barr, *Tales of the End: A Narrative Commentary on the Book of Revelation* (Santa Rosa, 1998).

<sup>3</sup> J.L. Resseguie, *Revelation Unsealed: A Narrative Critical Approach to John's Apocalypse* [Bib.Int 32] (Leiden/ Boston/Cologne, 1998). None of these three works is a commentary in the classical sense, although all three address the whole of Revelation as an entity.

which it is worth taking the trouble to extract. What remains far from agreed is, *how we get at it*. So, behind any answer to the question of *what is Revelation about* lurks the interpreter, and *what he or she is about* (with their agenda, tools and methods). Since “methodological imperialism is passing from the scene,”<sup>4</sup> and as the methods being applied to Revelation proliferate, now is a good time to ask *how?*

Given today’s bewildering diversity of interpretative approach – as true in Revelation studies as in other areas – one might ask if the multifarious readings of Revelation found on today’s library or book-shop shelves are moving the interpretative task forward. Before assessing three such contributions, we must do two things: Set the question of *how one should read Revelation* in context, to see what is at stake; and first and foremost give a rapid survey of interpretative approaches (*Revelation is about...*), albeit minus both detail and finesse.<sup>5</sup>

\* \* \*

*What is Revelation about?* There are, in the first place, those who still want to say *Revelation is about us*.<sup>6</sup> Here, the interpreter always trumps the text, by saying *this in the book means that in our experience*. Where the interpreter stands takes precedence over where John stood, on the assumption that the fog which beclouded

---

<sup>4</sup> Joel Green, The Challenge of Hearing the New Testament, in J.B. Green (ed.), *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation* (Grand Rapids, 1995), p. 6.

<sup>5</sup> For a proper digest of interpretation ancient or modern, see A. W. Wainwright, *Mysterious Apocalypse. Interpreting the Book of Revelation* (Nashville, 1993). Regretfully, we virtually restrict ourselves to English-language contributions in this section.

<sup>6</sup> Hal Lindsey’s decoding of Revelation’s visions in terms of the Cold War and the arms race is probably the most famous recent example (*There’s a New World Coming*, New York, 1975).

John has cleared, allowing us to see.<sup>7</sup> This could be called the *my time* approach – reading Revelation with an eye on one’s watch.

Hardly anybody now argues that *Revelation is about unfolding history*, programmatic of whole epochs and stages of human development, a huge canvas painted only with broad monochrome brushstrokes till the interpreter, with hindsight, comes and adds perspective, detail and colour.<sup>8</sup> But there is no shortage of voices to insist that *Revelation is about the End*, that most or all of the book relates to our world’s final tomorrow, that its pages contain some calendar of the future.<sup>9</sup> We will call these *all time* and *future time* standpoints, respectively, from which to view the Apocalypse.

These interpretative angles on time and history all involve reading meaning into rather than out of the book.<sup>10</sup> The corrective has been

---

<sup>7</sup> Another interpretation of this sort, with centuries of pedigree, takes the gaudy whore of chapter seventeen to be the Roman or papal Church – a line sometimes toed by Protestantism, but actually as old as the Montanists. Yet another approach, just as interested in the prostitute but for very different reasons, is post-modern and current, taking John and his depictions of women (from a gender-specific, feminist perspective) to be a misogynist – thus Tina Pippin, *Death and Desire: The Rhetoric of Gender in the Apocalypse of John* (Louisville, 1992). Other deconstructionist approaches belong here, too.

<sup>8</sup> Related to the previous approach, in this case the interpreter usually situates his or her own era at the ultimate or penultimate level. E.B. Elliott’s three-volume *Horae Apocalypticae* (London, 1846) remain unrivalled in their detailed proposal as to how *this in the book equals that in the history of the West*.

<sup>9</sup> The assumption that *this in the book means that in tomorrow’s world* plays an important part in the mature, sober exegesis of R.H. Mounce, (*The Book of Revelation*, Grand Rapids, 1998<sup>2</sup> [first edition, 1977]); it also underpins the wholesale schematising of Revelation’s data into a timetable of end-time events which characterises dispensationalist readings.

<sup>10</sup> It might seem, at first sight, that futurist interpretation cannot be so accused, since tomorrow (being future) is currently unknown. However, this is mere sleight-of-hand, since *future time* still functions in an

to pay closer attention to what Revelation itself is saying about time and history. Academic study of Revelation has therefore largely wanted to say *Revelation is about the first century*. The aim is to safeguard Revelation's relevance to its very first readers by discerning how the book relates to its first-century context.

Scholarship has a short memory, and can give the impression that there is only one variant of this approach: *Revelation is about first-century Roman Asia*.<sup>11</sup> Generally, this is a two-part model combining (i) reconstruction of life in Ephesus and her sister-cities in the 90s C.E. – attempting to describe *Asian Christian experience* as interpreters of Paul would for Corinth or Philippi in the 50s C.E.; and (ii) a hermeneutic where *this in the text relates to that in the social realities* (political and religious) as *historically reconstructed*.

An older, forgotten consensus applied a similar strategy while following an alternative paradigm: *Revelation is about the demise of Second Temple Judaism*. Here, John's recipients are caught up in a rift not with the post-Jamnia synagogues but with the Church's Jewish detractors in the pre-70 C.E. period.<sup>12</sup> The set of social realities is different, and an alternative construction is put on textual

---

identical way as an external lever for prising meaning out of the text. We are emphatically *not* saying, here, that Revelation should not, at some point in the interpretative process, speak to the reader in his or her time-frame (whether *my*, *all* or *future*, for the sake of argument): What we are contesting is the correctness of situating this at the starting-point – it ought to come at or near the end.

<sup>11</sup> Most modern scholarly work not only assumes this, but considers it the only legitimate assumption.

<sup>12</sup> This consensus was still adhered to by M.S. Terry, *Biblical Apocalypses* (Grand Rapids, 1988 [1898]), whose commentary on Revelation (pp.253–481) engages with early proponents of what was to become the dominant twentieth-century view.

materials thought to refer to externals. But both versions might be conveniently labelled *NT time* constructs.<sup>13</sup>

Dropping anchor within the first-century is a fundamentally correct effort to read meaning out of, and not into, the text. Nevertheless, like the three methods already sketched, this strategy too, unless supplemented and corrected, risks imposing realism on a text characterised, instead, by symbolism. Realism is the view that John's *real* story lies not in the apocalyptic symbol-laden tale he tells but in a *real life* story which this one supposedly allegorises.

Whenever the reigning academic model wants to lock Revelation's meaning firmly into contemporary history, or the other approaches seek to tie it into all of history or future history, the result is the same: straitjacketing the perceived message of the book into a particular referential framework to which John's diction is obliged to conform.<sup>14</sup> But it is not at all clear that *this* (or any) apocalypse relates to history in the way thoroughgoing realism posits.<sup>15</sup>

We have space to note just one other type of reading which sits more loosely to history and either relativizes or discards time in favour of a different kind of frame – thought, or experience. Here, the interpreter prefers meaningful and timeless ideas to history and,

---

<sup>13</sup> These two strategies place Revelation somewhere in the second half of the first century, the period most scholars take as sufficient for situating the genesis of all the NT documents.

<sup>14</sup> A good example of an interpreter unusually alive to the internal subtleties of John's language and message, but nonetheless hamstrung by allegiance to the externals of the *Roman Asia consensus* in the scholarly guild, is Eugene Boring, *Revelation* (Louisville, 1989).

<sup>15</sup> We cannot, here, explore how Revelation might or might not fit a particular historical and social matrix, or broach the complex questions raised by the notions apocalypse, apocalyptic eschatology and apocalypticism, or even review what might be meant by a revelatory account; J.J. Collins considers such issues in *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge, 1997<sup>2</sup>), especially ch.1, The Apocalyptic Genre (pp.1-42).

once assembled, they say *Revelation is about Christian life on earth* – nowadays, understood in a positive way.<sup>16</sup> Christian interpreters all aspire to reaching this point eventually, whatever interpretative snakes and ladders they went up or down en route. Based on the perceived theological value of the book, a maxim is formulated and followed: *This in the book inspires that in our Christian living*, in terms of worship,<sup>17</sup> resistance under persecution<sup>18</sup> or simply robust Bible reading.<sup>19</sup> This method could be called *time for the text*; when used to qualify and curtail a flexible, *NT time* sort of reading, a framework begins to emerge for hearing this highly symbolical and rhetorical first-century text.

Just enough has been said to show that we are basically arguing, here, for a certain, deliberate “reasoned eclecticism” (as Guthrie

---

<sup>16</sup> It was not, of course, always so. Retributive judgment and hellfire were predominant mediaeval focuses grounded in Revelation. The disparagement or more often, the silence of classic theological liberalism concerning the book is probably to be explained by a distaste for the ideas and ideals it was thought to commend, such as the too pressing reality and power of the demonic, its picture of a God given to gory vengeance, and the like.

<sup>17</sup> Readers, depending on their churchmanship, may think of various masses, cantatas, or worship songs which Revelation has inspired in contemporary church music.

<sup>18</sup> We have read the recent German translation of a commentary born in the context of the wartime Nazi occupation of the Low Countries, written by Kleijs Kroon (*Der Sturz der Hure Babylon*, tr. Berlin, 1988); for the relevance of Revelation to oppressed black Christians in apartheid South Africa, compare A.A. Boesak, *Comfort and Protest - The Apocalypse from a South-African Perspective* (Philadelphia, 1987).

<sup>19</sup> We may note, here, the welcome rehabilitation in our day of Revelation as a Christian book, as exemplified by the painstaking work of Richard Bauckham (*The Climax of Prophecy*, Edinburgh, 1993, and *The Theology of the Book of Revelation*, Cambridge, 1993).

calls it)<sup>20</sup> in interpretation. And most recent interpreters of Revelation have, in point of fact, combined two or more strategies. So, then, the question *how*, to which we now move, can only be answered in the plural.

\* \* \*

What should take methodological priority? The problem can be approached via the following limerick:

*There once was a hacker called John  
Who typed **caelum.org** and logged on  
He downloaded a story  
Of conflict and glory  
And a virus: Now the formatting's gone...*

Limericks have severe limitations, yet this little piece of doggerel does highlight some key issues and help us reflect on *how we get at what John is getting at*. First, let us unpack the limerick's baggage – one piece per line – in a simple *this equals that* equation, intentionally reminiscent of much past interpretation of Revelation. We are, by the way, claiming knowledge of authorial intention: The limerick's real author (behind its narrator) and the present writer are one and the same!

*There once was a hacker called John:* Dubbing John a hacker is grossly anachronistic. But readers will recognise an analogy; the seer who saw and heard what the Apocalypse recounts is being assimilated to modern computer hackers. Where do the similarities lie? In anonymity and ingenuity. The unknown master of web technology who breaks into a supposedly secure site or system, exploiting and divulging what is found there, somehow resembles the almost nameless and faceless medium John whose astral travelling, entrancement or altered state of consciousness made him party to hidden knowledge, which he then revealed.

---

<sup>20</sup> George Guthrie, Boats in the Bay: Reflections on the Use of Linguistics and Literary Analysis in Biblical Studies, in S.E. Porter & D.A. Carson (ed.), *Linguistics and the New Testament* (Sheffield, 1999), p.35.

*Who typed **caelum.org** and logged on:* You can visit a web-site, watch, listen to, chat about and otherwise interact with what is going on there, yet this multimedia experience remains only *virtual* reality (though tied to the real world of monitors, speakers and headphones), summed up in the one pregnant word *online*. John, in the analogy, had a server connecting him to heaven and letting him see, hear, discuss and participate in heaven-centred action tied in to his ordinary *here and now* but belonging to another *then and there*.

*He downloaded a story:* New capacity (software), or maybe new music, pictures and film clips (via digital technology), or new text-based information in word-processed documents – once downloaded to disk – can be used and enjoyed, manipulated, modified and shared. Similarly, John in this scenario clicked on a ‘story,’ domesticated it for his own and his readership’s use and profit, filtered it through his mind and related it to his and their experience.

*Of conflict and glory:* Here, like the document saved to disk with a pithy title, the limerick encapsulates what the ‘story’ is in just two words, *conflict* and *glory*. The claim is that John has told his story in such a way as to make these two themes central, encapsulating what the entire narrative is basically about.

*And a virus: Now the formatting’s gone...:* The sting of online pleasure is the virus lurking undetected in an e-mail which, if it infects the hard disk, will wreak some degree of havoc with the files. By comparison, some concealed disruptive element has caused trouble with John’s document so that, when it flashes up on our screen, the formatting has gone haywire and we read some or all of it as gobbledegook.

What are the five interpretative options hidden in the rhyme? In a question and answer format, they are:

1. Who was John and what did he get up to? One minority view says John was an otherwise unknown astral prophet

whose esoteric visionary experience lies behind what is now Revelation.<sup>21</sup>

2. What is the fiction we are dealing with? Some would say Revelation comes dressed as an original report of a visionary ascent, in the trappings that mark such scenarios.<sup>22</sup>
3. What sort of book is the end-product? Sifted by his personality, filtered through a religious world-view and experience his readers share, John has come up with a finished article whose genre is best called 'narrative'.<sup>23</sup>
4. What is the book about? Revelation may be subtle and complex, but this question has received many short answers; one such calls it a book about conflict and glory.<sup>24</sup>
5. Why so much disagreement? Revelation is persistently called gobbledegook, because of alleged interference affecting what the writing transmits or what the reader receives (or both); the remedy? either rearrange the text or – more frequently – re-educate the reader.

The five questions can be rephrased as tasks, or as handles for grasping at Revelation's meaning: Characterisation of its author;

---

<sup>21</sup> Thus Bruce Malina, *On the Genre and Message of Revelation: Star Visions and Sky Journeys* (Peabody, 1995) and, by extension, B. Malina and J.J. Pilch, *Social-Science Commentary on the Revelation of John* (Minneapolis, 2000).

<sup>22</sup> John Sweet, *Revelation* (London, 1990), pp.43,44, takes this view.

<sup>23</sup> Pierre Prigent, *L'Apocalypse de St. Jean* (Geneva, 2000), p.64, for example, characterises Revelation as a blend of narrative (vision report) and prophecy.

<sup>24</sup> 'Conflict and glory' is our own, tongue-in-cheek proposal. One can even encounter encapsulations of Revelation in just one word, of which 'worship' might be the least misleading.

identification of his original revelatory experience; definition of his book by form, function and content; description of what he basically meant to say; and sorting bad interpretations of his message from good.

Not the *only* or even necessarily the *chief* interpretative tasks, these are just *some* tasks which potentially face *any* serious interpreter of Revelation, and they introduce us to a problematics: *How we get at what John is getting at*. The nature of visionary experience will concern us no further here, and we will return to the question of John as author below (see our discussion of Garrow). The remaining three tasks ever so innocently turn out to address our *how* question, and we must now make this explicit.

First point five. The lingering charge is that Revelation is gobbledegook, insider language, a religious code, accessible only to those readers trained in unscrambling it. The allegation must be rebutted; put politely, calling only code-cracking interpretations of Revelation 'good' is confiscation of the text and a case of *how not to handle it*; moreover, this has had two unfortunate corollaries:

- habitually looking outside the text for *this equals that* solutions to supposedly insoluble conundrums: while this worked well for decompressing our limerick just now, it is a category mistake to be deplored in the case of Revelation; and,
- (worse still) failing to engage seriously with the text in its rich complexity, and causing Revelation's obvious élan to come to a grinding halt<sup>25</sup> through exegetical imprecision and lack of literary and theological imagination.

Next task three, which we will use to illustrate the *how* question. Whatever else Revelation may be, the limerick is right to call it a narrative with its own 'story' to tell. Exegesis and interpretation have to find *how* to study and appreciate what holds Revelation

---

<sup>25</sup> This is Jacques Ellul's complaint in *L'Apocalypse, architecture en mouvement* (Paris, 1975), which has largely gone unheeded.

together and what keeps it moving along. As to what *sort* of narrative Revelation is, we will briefly deal with this issue in our closing section.

Lastly point four. If Beethoven met the musicologist who proposed the true but banal insight that the rhythmic motif *puh-puh-puh-pom* is an interpretative key to most of his renowned fifth symphony, he would probably say “don’t come to the concert.” Similarly, the very idea of boiling down Revelation’s contents to a series of propositions is wrong-headed; it is another example of *how not to handle the text*, of a method which literally kills Revelation’s many-sidedness, movement and vitality,<sup>26</sup> characteristics which any one-sitting reading (silent or audible) would pick up.

In other words, neatly boxing Revelation into stultifying categories radically impoverishes John’s work. In saying *what Revelation is about* there must be sensitive interpretation able to account for Revelation’s narrative verve and capable of reflecting something of the depth, breadth and scope of thematic development in the book. Is scholarship ready to meet the challenge?

We believe it is, because of a crucial conclusion around which a strong consensus has formed and upon which, in our view, Revelation studies can resolutely build. In spite of David Aune’s recent, massively erudite three-volume assertion to the contrary,<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Ellul again, op.cit., pp.54,55.

<sup>27</sup> D.E. Aune, *Revelation 1-5* [WBC 52a], (Dallas, 1997), *Revelation 6-16* [WBC 52b] and *Revelation 17-22* [WBC 52c] (Nashville, 1998). Other recent commentaries had occasionally still advocated a composite view, such as Heinrich Kraft in Germany (*Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, Tübingen, 1974) or Josephine Ford in the United States (*Revelation*, Garden City, 1975). Aune has exhaustively furnished parallel external evidence for better measuring the diction and thought of Revelation, but the interpretative priority he gives to externals borders on parallelogomania, distracting exegetical and theological attention from what *what this text uniquely says*. Like Pierre Prigent for instance (op.cit., p.69), we remain profoundly unconvinced by Aune’s *a priori* hypothesis of disparate, pre-existing components assembled later into our Apocalypse; this view still

most scholars now take Revelation to be the intricate compositional unity that Father Allo already demonstrated it to be nearly eighty years ago, when he took on source-critical theory in its heyday.<sup>28</sup> Richard Bauckham's careful work has permitted him to reinforce this conclusion: "Revelation... is not simply a literary unity, but actually one of the most unified works in the New Testament."<sup>29</sup> We have found in our own research that what is borne out by the data of the text is indeed the view that Revelation is an organically unified narrative.<sup>30</sup> Our three dialogue partners here all share this view.

Before turning to their contributions we must first, however, press the point that Rev.1:1-22:21 is to be read as a subtly composed and carefully disposed unity, by asking what would be the consequence (for *how we get at what John is getting at*) if scholarship rigorously set itself to do so. Surely it is simply this: That *what Revelation is about* could only be construed as *what it is ALL about*. In other words, faced with as nuanced and internally coherent a narrative as John's, nothing short of a detailed and subtle account of its complex goings-on will do as a means to obtaining an accurate reflection of its contents and purpose. It is from this resolutely whole-text perspective that we now cursorily examine our three chosen interpretations.

\* \* \*

---

partially wields Charles' old brush for tarring and feathering the allegedly stupid hypothetical final redactor (*The Revelation of St. John*, Edinburgh, 1920, vol.1, 1, IV The Editor of the Apocalypse, where is expressed the view that Rev.20:4ss "exhibits a hopeless mental confusion and a tissue of irreconcilable contradictions.")

<sup>28</sup> E.-B. Allo, St. Jean, l'Apocalypse (Paris, 1933) was responding especially to Charles.

<sup>29</sup> *The Climax of Prophecy* (Edinburgh, 1993), ch.1 Structure and Composition, p.1, n.1.

<sup>30</sup> This has been our own working hypothesis during doctoral research on Revelation from the perspective of its unity of theme (thesis forthcoming).

Alan Garrow thinks John has certainly downloaded a ‘story,’ summarised (in John’s own words, not Garrow’s), as *what must soon take place*, Rev.1:1 – yet, he also thinks the formatting has gone, since after this beginning John “then goes on to confuse us utterly.”<sup>31</sup> For Garrow, however, it is not that the story’s events have got scrambled by some incompetent editor. Instead, the book’s hitherto undetected structure (or, ‘story organisation,’ p.14) has confused readers for centuries – for this author, not the text as garbled transmitter but the reader as muddled receiver is at fault.

Garrow’s principal chapter (pp.14-65) aims to show the hapless reader the story in the text. That story, assumed to involve only action on earth (e.g. p.60), is identified with the contents of the main scroll introduced in Rev.5:1-9 (for Garrow, following Bauckham, one and the same as its diminutive look-alike in 10:1ss). This story’s narrative skeleton is first exposed [in 6:1-17, 7:9-17, 8:2-9:21 (with 11:14), 10:1-11 and 11:1-13], before being clad in flesh [by 12:1-14:4, 15:6-16:21 and 19:11b-21:8] in the remainder of the book. Garrow calls the bones ‘foreshadowings’ – their function is to anticipate – and the flesh ‘direct revelations’ (functionally speaking, recounts) of the scroll’s contents.

Then an original and provocative case is made for seeing Revelation as a serialised text in six instalments of roughly equal length (where 3:22, 8:1, 11:18, 15:4 and 19:10 represent the ‘breaks’) and with parallel characteristics (such as suspense build-up, a closing hymn, or a new ‘opening’), where episode one (1:1-3:22) majors on getting the audience’s attention and insuring they switch on again next week, and every episode finishes with a Eucharist.

Stories often surprise. So, just when we expect Garrow “to examine the story-telling passages... and demonstrate that the characters therein perform a coherent sequence of actions with respect to one another” (pp.63, 65), so proving that his structural theory is well-

---

<sup>31</sup> Op.cit., p.124. What is significant is that this is Garrow’s way of beginning his own *conclusion*. Partly, of course, this is because his book claims to “solve the age-old problem” of just what the story is.

founded, he instead says (in a nutshell) *this method is incapable of getting at what the story means!* Why must John's (still untold!) story be labelled, in advance, as inherently incomprehensible? Because – surprise, surprise – what the story means is to be found not in the text, but outside it. Why? Because Revelation is like a political cartoon strip – meaningless “without knowledge of the circumstances on which the cartoonist was commenting” (p.65). Interaction with the questions this remark raises about Revelation's function and purpose would, alas, require a different article!

Of course, Garrow himself tells a good story, and short-changing his reader like this is just postponement. Later, we do get interpretation of 12:1-14:5 (in seven sections), 15:6-21, 17:1-18 (itself an interpretation of the previous unit) and 19:11-21:8 – all summarised in terms of their principal characters and main action (pp.80-102), then helpfully diagrammed (pp.104-17) “to show the broad flow of the events depicted.”

But what has Garrow done here? He has, crucially, stepped *outside* the text of Revelation in search of a referential framework into which to insert its story. The one he finds, like the rest of his book, shows originality, for he glosses the sixth seal as inspired by the eruption of Vesuvius (in 79 C.E.), takes Titus to be reigning emperor and considers the socio-political climate of Roman Asia around the year 80 to be about right for the popular imagination to be haunted by the idea of a returning Nero. Garrow, here, makes a familiar hermeneutical move to the high ground of time and history, to protect the story which John's hearers would have understood, and prevent it becoming some other fanciful tale in the hands of today's undisciplined interpreter.

But was John really a pundit? An otherwise unknown ancient equivalent of a political editor, chronicling and interpreting imperial events for subscribers who more or less shared his perspective? And does Revelation therefore 'reveal' the insights of a first-century journalist? Further, do we accept Garrow's implicit claim that our modern reconstructed history of the events (assuming we have got the right ones) is actually the *true story*, or that this *other story* constitutes the interpretative key to unlocking any remaining gobbledegook in John's account?

We can formulate just one criticism here: *Overhasty extrapolation*. On the theoretical assumption that “ the meaning of a text is dependent on the context in which it is read ” (and with the further assumption that we can closely reproduce that context, pp.1-4), Garrow has allegorised John’s story before it has even been heard, thus neglecting the literary phenomena (including the knotty problem of who the hearers are), and electing not to listen to John’s story on its own terms. This is realism untempered by literary appreciation, and Garrow’s final chapter (*Why this story?*, pp.118-23) – which characterises John’s (still unexplored!) story as *polemic response* – is, to say the least, premature.<sup>32</sup>

David Barr, by contrast, appears to give John time to tell his own tale, claiming *only* to be interested in Revelation as a story – how it is told, whom it is about, what it consists of, where it is going (preface, x). Before exploring the narrative’s discourse (the way the story is told), Barr does say what for him the story is about: “ The Apocalypse is in its most basic sense a retelling of (the) story of Jesus in a new way and with new images ” (p.3). This is not, however, reductionism but basically pedagogy, so as to orientate the reader at the start of a prologue designed to alert him or her to matters of story content, Revelation’s genre and world-view, visual and audible symbols, structure and plot, audience and characters, and time and place (pp.1-24).

For Barr, John’s story consists of three-tales-in-one or three narrative segments: *Letter Scroll* (1:1-3:22), *Worship Scroll* (4:1-11:18) and *War Scroll* (11:19-22:21). What distinguishes the second from the first is a shift in setting, from earth (or, normal time and space) to the heavenly throne-room (called extra-normal time and space), and what legitimises the claim that there is a ‘ new story ’ after 11:19 is the change in main actor from God to the dragon (pp.101-02) as well as a further shift into “ meta-time and meta-space ” (p.121). Episode three then profits from the change

---

<sup>32</sup> We have said enough in this brief précis to make it clear that Garrow’s work has considerable merit; here, however, we cannot give various important issues he raises the attention they deserve.

brought about by number two to take us back to the concerns of episode one: The letters “ sketched the need for struggle,” the worship scroll showed “ the mode of God’s victory ” and now the war scroll delves “ more deeply into the conflict ” (p.102), explaining “ why it is that Jesus can instruct the churches... and enable the worship of God ” (p.149).

Garrow located Revelation’s main story in the second half of the book. Barr, similarly, calls sub-story three “ the strongest section of John’s writing,” a judgment he substantiates by study of the care with which the author has written it. By a procedure already employed for the first two scrolls, the story elements are isolated and discussed (pp.103-22) under the headings war stories, characters old and new, settings (places and times) and plot. Following this analysis, Barr then provides a synthetic commentary on the story action (pp.122-45) in eight narrative scenes (11:19-12:17; 12:18-13:18; 14:1-20; 15:1-16:21; 17:1-19:10; 19:11-21:8; 21:9-22:7; and 22:8-21), for each of which the details are interpreted via *readers’ notes* (again, as in the previous sections).

Like Garrow, Barr envisages Revelation being performed (though not in a serialised way) in the context of worship including a Eucharist (p.180). Unlike Garrow he largely refrains from extrapolating out from Revelation’s story to the social setting with which it might reverberate until he has thoroughly worked over the story with the tools of narrative criticism. It is only in his epilogue that he considers the relationship between author and audience (pp.160-64) and examines the social situation of Jews and Christians in the Roman world (pp.164-69), before venturing to describe Revelation’s aim as that of promoting “ consistent resistance ” to the encroachments of Roman culture. John’s Revelation, on this view, told a story which powerfully sought to take its hearers, via ritual transformation, “ into a community of a shared vision of the struggle between Roman culture and Christian conviction ” (p.180).

Barr's assessment of Revelation's *Sitz im Leben* thus accords with the predominant view.<sup>33</sup> As with Garrow's reading, we want to ask if he did methodological justice to the *what* question, in other words, we are once more asking *did he go about it right?* Barr himself offers the exhortation "Revelation was primarily a story to be heard... learn to listen," and sets out (preface, xi) to furnish the reader with knowledge and resources for arriving at a viable interpretation of the book. Has he succeeded?

Yes and no. One successful outcome is Barr's refinement and popularising of contemporary literary theory, initiating the neophyte into its resources and showing how to use them to mine some of Revelation's considerable wealth. And one glaring weakness comes from asking a solely literary set of questions of John's book; Barr largely fails to assimilate answers found to other kinds of question already asked of *Revelation as a unified entity* – in particular, the materials provided by many commentators who, when faced with Revelation as a whole, integrated their attention to its nature and function as a literary work<sup>34</sup> with historical and other concerns.

Barr's tools, methods and goals in *Tales of the End* prepare us for Resseguei's narrative critical approach to Revelation, and its yet more rigorous use of modern literary theory. Instead of walking his

---

<sup>33</sup> Thus Jonathan Knight, *Revelation* (Sheffield, 1999), whose revised Domitianic hypothesis may certainly be seen as representative.

<sup>34</sup> We ought not to forget that although literary theory has metamorphosed from one –ism to another, changing its philosophy and discarding old tools/methods while fashioning new ones as it goes, study of Revelation as literature has been going on for a long time. A good example is the literary awareness that series of similar judgments means understanding Revelation's goings-on as something other than chronological, an insight present in the very earliest commentary on Revelation that we possess: Victorinus, in about 260 C.E., said in relation to the seals, trumpets and bowls, "nec requirendus est ordo in Apocalypsi, sed intellectus requirendus." Every interpreter owes a debt of gratitude to predecessors; but more than showing gratitude, there is a duty to preserve, transmit and incorporate into interpretation valid insights from the past.

readers through Revelation and alerting them to what is going on along the way, Ressegueie as it were backlights the whole text of the Apocalypse in advance as 'narrative,' then carefully spotlights it from five successive angles: rhetoric (numerals, repetition, metaphor and simile); point of view (or narrative modes, covering space, time, emotion, speech and values); setting (or environment, including space, time and also mood); character (characters are 'round,' 'flat' or 'stock'); and lastly plot (involving issues of causality, conflict, suspense and 'defamiliarisation,' or jolting the reader's perceptions). All these analytical tools are explained and their use illustrated (pp.1-27), before they are applied in turn to Revelation.

A final preliminary issue (in this he parallels Garrow) concerns the vexed question, for narrative theory, of where to put the reader. Is the reader of a text to be situated *in it* (with the structuralists, hunting for the one reader who fits the text), *over it* (with any and all subjectivists who say *Revelation* – or any text – *is about us readers*) or *with it* (which unites text and any potential reader in an interactive dialogue)?

Ressegueie adopts a form of the third view, seeing possibilities for the author-text-reader relationship optimistically; his is a reader who has worked hard at doing three things: Becoming like one of John's original audience (with its world-view or attitudes); acquiring the author's 'repertoire' which, to refer back to our limerick, is something like virus crunching or maybe self-formatting in "literary and cultural competence" (p.30); and finally, adopting the active role John envisaged for his reader (for example trying to figure out what chapters 6-22 have to do with the seven churches, or what the relationship is between seals, trumpets and bowls, or how Revelation's visions and auditions square up to one another).

Ressegueie distils all this literary theory so as to kit his reader out for making an adequate appraisal of Revelation as narrative. The tools certainly look sharp enough once applied to the dismantled text (pp.32-192). Grasp of an overall story begins to emerge when, at the final stage, he considers plot and structure (pp.160ff.) and analyses

Revelation chapter by chapter as an example of the standard U-shaped pattern of comedy.<sup>35</sup> Resseguie shows greater sophistication here than Garrow: Initial stability is on earth; final stability is in both earth and heaven; in chapters 6-19, not just from 11:19 onwards, instabilities are on earth but seen from a heavenly viewpoint. [Personally, we would go farther, locating Revelation's deliberate ambiguity on the heaven-earth distinction at the moment of heavenly ascent in 4:1 and charting its progress up to and including the abolition of the frontier in the final vision]

Prior to plot analysis, Resseguie explores the data from three angles: Point of view/rhetoric (pp.32-69) examines the different aspects of narrative perspective which, we might say, colour what is happening where it is happening; setting (pp.70-102) entails recognising John's topographical or architectural places as essentially 'spiritual' (perhaps 'symbolic' would be better) rather than 'physical' – try finding Armageddon on any map – and several 'props' (like scrolls, or trumpets) are also studied; lastly, most space is reserved for character (pp.103-59) and notably, a sustained contrast between 'demonic characters' and corresponding earth-and-heaven characters.

Resseguie's careful attention to narrative components and how they fit together might frustrate readers more interested in, say, historical criticism or a theological appreciation of Revelation.<sup>36</sup> But if, as we

---

<sup>35</sup> I.e., moving from stability through misfortune back to happy ending. Resseguie opts for a linear view of Revelation's development, rejecting the idea of recapitulation. Scholars remain divided here (see M.E. Boring, Revelation, in M.A. Powell (ed.) *The New Testament Today* (Louisville, 1999). However, the data of the text (notably, the septets) fit a hybrid view best, since they prove that John, as he proceeds, is both going back over old ground and also – often simultaneously – advancing into new territory. If recapitulation is circular, and progress is linear, then the hybrid model (which we favour) is a spiral.

<sup>36</sup> In fact, Resseguie finishes (pp.193-209) with a sevenfold *reprise* of Revelation from the standpoint of its theological significance; whilst this means he keeps faith with his intention of resolutely applying narrative criticism to Revelation, the chapter (in our view) fails to capitalise on the

have urged, *what Revelation is about* means *what it is ALL about*, then putting together and using this sort of narrative tool-kit for dismantling and reassembling the workings of the story is what is needed. For the cumulative effect of these analyses is that, by the time the interpreter is faced with the task (on the macro-level of plot and structure), of describing Revelation's unity of action from its origin through complication to final *dénouement*, he or she has developed a critical awareness of the density and complexity of the sophisticated story being told. In this way, we avoid truncating Revelation's story or yielding to the temptation to tell another.

Barr's endnotes and Resseguie's footnotes show that both endorse the findings of other methodologies for studying Revelation. Neither scholar attempts much dialogue – Resseguie's declared aim was literary introduction to the Apocalypse (p.1), so he is hardly to be faulted for achieving it. However, both studies in building up a narrative critical dossier on Revelation, manage to avoid the danger of retreating into narratology's ivory tower. What must still be attempted, though, is the integration of literary critical expertise with other interpretative skills appropriate to the handling of a book like Revelation, and the synthesis of the results obtained with the data other, compatible analyses provide.

\* \* \*

What might such compatible strategies be if we are to progress farther along the interpretative road which Revelation's essential literary unity opens up? Only two, modest suggestions will now be made.

First, if the bottom line argued here is that we can no longer neglect interaction with Revelation as a self-contained narrative, the question remains of exactly *what sort of narrative* it is; our answers (plural, in the case of Revelation)<sup>37</sup> determine how we treat the text. In this connection, we are content here to unzip only one

---

rich gains of the foregoing study, and reads something like theological afterthoughts.

<sup>37</sup> Corresponding to the book's mixed genre.

file, already very compressed but innocuously labelled **ot.zip**, containing three documents all needing additional work:

- *Is Revelation apocalyptic or prophecy?* A well-known and largely unresolved controversy, but for our purposes one aspect of it remains insufficiently explored: *the formal*. The work already done to situate John's Revelation over against Jewish, Christian and other apocalypses needs to be matched by, and later integrated with, careful study of the phenomena that link it almost genetically to the Old Testament books of Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel and Zechariah. We have in mind not just intertextual allusions or echoes, but whole-book literary and rhetorical concerns (such things as structures and patterns, imagery and themes, concerns and world-view...)
- *Where did John get this story?* "From Christian experience in 90s C.E. Ephesus" has become the virtually unanimous answer from the NT guild, but we have objected to this view's monopoly. A lot has been made of Revelation's alleged relationship to what little we know about Asian history under the Flavians; so far, only a little has been said about the book's possible connections with a lot of salvation history in the Hebrew Scriptures. The question is, *how does John's story relate to the story or stories the Hebrew Scriptures tell?*
- *What is Revelation's theology?* By analogy with Bauckham,<sup>38</sup> who approaches this question with the conviction "the literary and theological greatness are not separable" (p.22), we see a sustainable account of the theology of Revelation as being derivative of a full account of *what the book says and how it says it*. Systematic categories are still pressed into service for this task<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> *The Theology of the Book of Revelation* (Cambridge, 1993).

<sup>39</sup> For example, in Georg Strecker's *Theology of the New Testament* (Berlin/New York, 2000) – completed following Strecker's death in 1994

whereas, in keeping with the two previous points, it seems to us that only Biblical Theology can do the data justice. New Testament theology, in this instance, will have to reinvent itself and abandon abstraction for categories that attempt some kind of dynamic equivalence. Just as today, endangered antelope get to roam in managed parks instead of languishing in tiny zoo enclosures, so Revelation's theology needs uncaged, needs room to run.

Second, to return to the issue of 'story,' it is the present writer's opinion that work is only beginning on *how John tells his story*. Careful consideration of *how to explore how he does it* is therefore called for. For the Revelation explorer's kit, one appropriate *method* for studying the narrative, and one type of *analytical implement* for doing the job may be suggested: When examining our three chosen studies and their theoretical bases (in so far as these were explicit), neither this method nor the relevant tools were in evidence. We are talking about *theme* and how to study it.

Ressegue's last chapter does offer "a recapitulation of some of the major theological themes touched upon" (p.194), but since the subjects he summarily deals with (Church, evil, God, worship, salvation, Christ and the future) were not scrutinised by the foregoing literary analysis, this chapter turns out to be a lengthy postscript which, like all postscripts, basically says *I forgot*.

Indeed there is confusion, here, between 'theme' as an interpreter's propositional conclusions about the subject matter abstracted out of a narrative (as something *extraneous to the text*),<sup>40</sup> and 'theme' as a

---

by F.W. Horn (German edition, 1996) and translated into English by Eugene Boring – section D.IV The Coming of the Lamb – the Apocalyptic John (pp.515-45), we find after an introduction three headings: *christology*, (almost entirely expressed via christological predicates, with little or no feeling for the dynamic figures of the one like a son of man, the strong angel, the Messiah on his horse or the ubiquitous slain-but-standing lamb); *ecclesiology*; and *ethics*.

<sup>40</sup> This is, of course, a common understanding of theme. It is what Jonathan Knight means (op.cit.) when, in his conclusion, he groups under

heuristic category for analysing the content, structure or progress of the narrative itself (something contained *within the text*). The latter, with its subsets such as topic, motif or leitmotiv, has traditionally been as much a part of basic literary appreciation as, say, characterisation or locale or plot (all of which Barr and Resseguie study): Now in literature, just as settings change, characters evolve and plots unfold, so also do themes develop;<sup>41</sup> in arriving at a literary appreciation, *all* these aspects – each distinct and each irreducible – must be given due weight.

The compositional sophistication of John's narrative is now increasingly recognised. Put surgically, Revelation as a composition needs to be dissected so as to understand both its anatomy (structure and form) and its physiology (function). One factor in Revelation's broad cohesion as a text, aiding the complex organisation or articulation of its parts into a whole, is theme – literary investigation of Revelation must now address this. Thus, today's discourse analysis may borrow from yesterday's older literary criticism.

If dissection too readily suggests the laceration of something dead, we should simultaneously speak of pursuing life-studies of theme (something like following a two-year-old around for a day). What we have in view here is a dynamic, with the interpreter as it were running alongside the thematic materials as they follow their vectors or trajectories, twisting and turning their way through the text. For example, theme is a major contributor to the linguistic unity of the

---

Themes of the Apocalypse (pp.156-68) cosmology, theology, sin and salvation, christology, trinitarianism and eschatology. But these are Jonathan's themes, not John's – a shrewd interpreter's conclusions about John's narrative, but certainly not the thematic constituents of that narrative.

<sup>41</sup> Recent scholarship has, from time to time, directed its attention to thematic concerns in Revelation. The most significant recent article to address this issue from the point of view of its hermeneutical importance (via one key theme) is by Kenneth Strand, 'Overcomer': A Study in the Macrodynamic of Theme Development in the Book of Revelation." *AUSS*, 28 (1990), pp.237-54.

book whose morphology has been variously pictured as a many-layered onion or rose, or “a prism refracting rich meaning in different and multiple ways”<sup>42</sup> or again as “whorls, vortices and eddies” in a stream.<sup>43</sup>

Failure to examine thematic texture in the literary analysis of Revelation will produce skewed results, for major narrative trajectories in the book are clearly thematic and must be factored in along with other phenomena when deciding *what Revelation is all about*. Instead of rapid fly-overs, there is a need for patient on-the-ground exploration of the diverse thematic materials thoughtfully deployed and developed by John as facets of his story.<sup>44</sup>

\* \* \*

Postscript: In their work on Revelation’s story, Garrow, Barr and Ressegue all tell or evoke other stories; so here, finally, is a very short story about conflict (not glory):

*Two interpreters got in a row  
Over which matters more: what? or how?  
One said, – Method, that’s it!  
– No, it’s Content, you twit!  
Don’t suppose that we’ll ever know now...*

Gordon Campbell,  
Free Faculty of Reformed Theology,  
Aix-en-Provence.

---

<sup>42</sup> Both from Elisabeth Schüssler-Fiorenza, *Revelation: Vision of a Just World* (Edinburgh, 1993), p.19.

<sup>43</sup> This is the image favoured by Leonard Thompson, *The Book of Revelation: Apocalypse and Empire* (Oxford/New York, 1990).

<sup>44</sup> In our own research (as referred to above) we are engaged in a thematic analysis of John’s Revelation which attempts to proceed from the whole to the parts and back again.

*The Essential IVP Reference Collection.* (Leicester: IVP, 2001. £99.99). [J. C. McCullough]

When writing a review of the Anchor Bible Dictionary which appeared in 1992<sup>1</sup> I suggested that this might be the last edition of the Anchor Bible Dictionary, indeed any large Bible dictionary, which would be distributed in paper format. The future was electronic and all major dictionaries would be distributed electronically with a licence so that there could be constant updates, as needed, downloaded from the internet. I was wrong! Many important Bible Dictionaries and Encyclopaedias have been published in paper form since then. But I was not completely wrong because there is now a thriving electronic publishing industry and alongside it more and more books and dictionaries are being published, in both forms, paper and electronic. This is the route which Intervarsity Press have taken. The important IVP Dictionaries which have already been published are now available on a CD, price £99.99.

The advantages of this method of publication are clear. It is almost mind boggling to think that the following books are contained on one little disc:

*New Bible Commentary*

*New Bible Dictionary*

*New Dictionary of Theology*

*New Dictionary of Biblical Theology*

*Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*

*Dictionary of Jesus and Gospels*

*Dictionary of Paul and letters*

*Dictionary of the later New Testament and its development*

*Dictionary of the New Testament Background*

*New Bible Atlas*

---

<sup>1</sup> IBS 15 April (1993) p. 94 'Perhaps this problem of differing needs and interests among scholars will be solved in the future by the introduction of CD Rom and a licensing agreement, which would allow far more flexibility in the information one buys access to (as well as the opportunity to keep the information constantly up to date).

*The IVP Bible Background Commentary (Old Testament)*

*The IVP Bible Background Commentary (New Testament)*

*Hard Sayings of the Bible*

Not to mention a free copy of the AV Bible and 8 other translations which can be 'unlocked' for a suitable fee. The advantages of having this compact library available to a travelling scholar, student or minister and his or her laptop are immense.

The package comes with an excellent search facility which is another great advantage to the scholar or minister. It is extremely powerful and is an invaluable tool for gaining access to the whole library, throwing up gems of information from unexpected places. However, it is a little difficult to use at first, as a raw search of a popular words such as 'ministry' or 'Gospel' throws up a bewildering array of 'hits'. Perhaps the next version might have a more sophisticated but also more user friendly search system of searching.

With two clear advantages in mind, are there any disadvantages? Certainly for someone of my generation, there is a certain reticence about using a screen rather than a book. The skill of reading continuously from a monitor has not been properly developed. Time after time I have used the search engine in the CD rom to find the references and then gone back to my paper copies to consult them! Probably, however, new generations of students and scholars who have lived with a computer all their lives, won't feel the need to have a pencil in hand as they scour the electronic page!

A second disadvantage is the price for those who have already bought the paper versions. In future it might be possible to develop a marketing strategy that allowed those who purchased one version of a dictionary (electronic or paper) to have a reduction in the price of the other version.

A third drawback is the static nature of the material. Astounding as it is to have all those books in only little disc ... and with the advent of DVDs there will be even more packed on to the disc ...it is, after all, only a duplication of what we already have. In the computer age, where interactivity is the buzz word, there exists the possibility of regular and cheap updating. Is there the possibility of taking a

much bolder approach by leaving the book format altogether and producing a large 'IVP reference' which consists of hundreds of articles on a CD, easily searchable and logically ordered, which are then updated frequently. Customers would then buy, not the CD, but a licence which would entitle them to free updates ....probably in the beginning in the form of CDs, but as technology becomes more widespread, through the internet and a re-writable DVD)?

The final verdict, however, on the project must be overwhelmingly positive. To have all that information at the touch of a button wherever one is, is incredibly useful, and, provided one has not already bought the paper versions, to have it at that price represents excellent value for money.

Wells, Ronald A, *People behind the Peace. Community and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999) [James Burnett]

Living in Northern Ireland, it is difficult to find a perspective on religion and politics with any degree of objectivity. This book, however, celebrates and calls others to celebrate the success of a Christian "objectivity" found in three particular communities against an historical backdrop of exclusivity and tribal subjectivism. It beckons both national and international readers alike to recognize those who have remained a reconciling voice in all of "the troubles". The critical question remains nevertheless: is this a fair or over- generous distribution of peace- process dividends to these thirty-year weathered peace investors?

On a preliminary reading, we might ask of the writer's own hermeneutical distance in writing this book and whether or not he has spoken too soon about peace - the end goal of the suggested progenitors of such an ideal; and moreover, if "the Peace" has arrived, to what extent can we attribute its realisation to three communities in particular?

Wells, an American, visits and then writes of the situation in N. Ireland (N.I.) and with an Atlantic Ocean swimming between both

countries that would seem far enough for good analysis. However the presence of some 20 million Irish in the States and a much evidenced bias towards a nationalist romanticism, might make some readers suspicious even before they open the book, despite the author's admission to being a Protestant.

But to the book. Wells' chapter on "A History of "the Troubles"" is brave in the undertaking: some 30 pages analyzing much of a millennium of the historical events and factors underpinning the current political climate. There are moments when, I, writing as a Presbyterian, can imagine some "cultural protestants" taking exception to the coverage of particular episodes in that history, like mentioning the brutality of Cromwell without going further into the horror of the uprising which led to such an invasion. (And this perhaps is important as we later encounter theories of forgiveness highlighting the necessity of mutually understood historical circumstances - what was done and what needs forgiven requires a parity of understanding by both parties involved in the reconciliation process.)

Nevertheless, in a tit for tat culture largely brewed from a tit for tat historical distillery, it is easy to be over-sensitive and Wells demonstrates accuracy and precision in highlighting the impurities of our time in such a limited space.

There is certainly more to be said historically, particularly from the dissenter tradition. The first people to feel the *Angst* of alienation and identity crisis - "Of what nation are we citizens?" (Page 9) - were certainly from this tradition and who at various times were without any real allegiance to Crown or Culture. This *Angst* has now become the predominant political feature of protestant political culture. Wells does not allow them much room in his historical analysis concentrating instead on the relationships between England and Ireland in this period. To understand "the troubles" however one needs perhaps to understand these peculiar Protestants in more depth and their added politics of suspicion.

Moving to the main subject of the book, the practical witness and reality of forgiveness in the three communities is a fascinating and moving read. What I like about Wells' work is that it is motivated

by a sense of the "miracle" that such communities could possibly exist in a place renowned for its violent intolerance of opposites. There is a sense too of the small becoming large, the insignificant in the eyes of the world growing stature and bearing fruit. There is a sense of the unstoppable mustard seed growing into the largest tree in the garden. These inspire Wells.

Similarly, in the notion of reconciliation, it is this command of Jesus to forgive just as you have been forgiven which reaches out the right hand of fellowship in theological dialogue and discourse. The vision of possibility that forgiveness cannot only find a place in the concrete reality of conflict, but could actually be the solution to that conflict, inspires much of this text. The respective Church's responses of forgiveness and the theological framework proffered by Donald Shriver in his book *An Ethic of Enemies* contributes to and outlines this horizon of hope.

But what inspires Wells most, and this book I suggest is largely written out of a sense of involvement, is practical. Living Communities doing reconciliation.

Corrymeela, building on a social witness to the traditional barriers in our society by bringing groups from both traditions together, convinces the wider community of the necessity of mutual understanding. Through these and other activities this community seeks to present God's unconditional grace to visitors.

The Christian Renewal Centre's emphasis is more "charismatic" and perhaps rightly so: one cannot seek to change people from sectarianism and violence without the regenerating (recreating) Spirit of God. Their work has been in the spiritual process of change and this has had a bearing on wider society by the produce of changed people.

And finally, The Columbanus Community: this is a community whose actions epitomize what is required in Wells' final analysis: after the agreement, we need to learn to live together, and the Columbanus Community is about living together, with its composition of residents embracing three major denominations: Roman Catholic, Anglican and Presbyterian.

The communities then are certainly behind peace, but to what extent can it be said they are behind the peace? This is a question which, in the absence of historical hindsight as well as sharp analytical tools from the social sciences, might leave one conjecturing as to the possibilities.

The following broad arguments can be ushered against the communities in their peace – building scope.

1. The whole idea of a community is one which raises questions of isolationism and remoteness to society. What can be achieved living in communities in three middle class areas of N. Ireland? There is always a sense in Belfast certainly that one can buy one's way out of the troubles if one can afford to live outside the sectarian housing estates. The argument is that of middle-class detachment.
2. A second area of life which could receive criticism is the sense of the religious fringe: social gospel, charismaticism, and overboard ecumenism. These are not proclaimed widely as representatives of broad Christianity in NI and therefore ownership by many within the larger denominations might not be significant.
3. A final argument lies in the achievements of the communities: how does one measure the successes of such communities, if, as already said, they are on the fringes of society with fringe based religious identities? Conservative Evangelicals, or Orthodox Christians, for instance, challenging the social division in society, would have much more credence and possibly greater scope to bring influence than these more suspicious doctrinal positions.

Such arguments are perhaps more likely to reflect how some view the three communities in NI in contrast to other observers across the Atlantic in the States. Nevertheless, the idea of communities exaggerating what we all as Christians ought to be doing, socially, in the work of the Spirit, and in seeking to "live together", cannot be so easily dismissed. They may go beyond what many would regard as "safe" Christianity, but in unison they speak of the moral wrong

of our social and religious bigotry and hatred. Exaggeration is after all creativity in search of attention.

It is unpleasant to come to terms with the reality that many in the conservative evangelical camp, and Wells points this out (p.115), have largely been opposed to any form of reconciliation. It is the bitter irony of Ulster conservative Christians that their claim to possess the most accurate understanding of grace (and one I cherish myself) is so completely soiled with ungraciousness towards those of different cultural and theological traditions. The fear of theological compromise has resulted in a bolstering of strong political associations and a lack of love for neighbour. Which brings us perhaps to the reality of these communities. That whatever theological “over-emphasis” some would suggest, one cannot easily circumvent the consistent witness to the gospel of love and neighbour which they have exemplified over 20 or 30 years.

To their critics, the communities may not have believed the right things, but in the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount, they have done the right actions.

At the beginning of his book Wells speaks of two readings of the scriptures, God’s favour for one tribe of people or God’s favour for all people, irrespective of tribe. He then points towards the history of salvation as God’s intention in the particular tribe culminating in Jesus and God’s intention of salvation to all. The success of the communities is in their witness to God’s generosity irrespective of tribe. Wells is right in this. Equally, in the testimony of those whom these communities have helped: families forced out of their homes, terrorists transformed by God’s love, and even the “Living together” facilitation of talks between parties and politicians. It is precisely this practical involvement in love which is so challenging to the context of N.I.

The communities, then, do deserve our appreciation. They began when there was no mention of peace on the political agenda or Peace Funds for cross-community work, and have encouraged others to stand against this absorbing sectarianism in NI.

Today there is a greater awareness, particularly among Christian leaders, of the wrongs of our tribalism. Other, non - community groups such as ECONI (Evangelical Contribution on Northern Ireland) are seriously engaging the minds of those more conservative and evangelical Christians to similar conclusions on the practical ethic of Christ in this context and changes are being seen in churches and their governing bodies. Theology seems to be catching up with Jesus and the Gospels.

And what of 'the Peace'? Are they behind it? Is this too grandiose a description? Many people have given much to this process and taken their leaps of faith quietly or in public. Some have even had the privilege of prizes and awards for their work. Perhaps the real value of Well's book is to give credence to the prophetic voice which has for so long echoed across Ulster's socio-political wasteland "as one crying in the wilderness" long before politicians could agree to talk or Christians agree on who was their neighbour.

Furthermore, in light of the tragic attack on America by terrorists on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001, it is clear we are in living through a paradigm shift in international relations. On the one hand Terrorism will no longer find the same degree of acceptance in the world as it had before (something which will help cement the peace-process in N. I.), and on the other hand, hopefully there will be a greater expectancy for communities, especially culturally divided ones, to find ways to live in peace. If this is the case, then the prophetic, exaggerated voice of these three communities have other audiences who need to hear what they have to say. Wells and his book may well help their listening, a role I'm sure he would cherish.

*Becoming and Being. The Doctrine of God in Charles Hartshorne and Karl Barth.* Colin E. Gunton, SCM Press, 2nd edition, 2001.  
[John Thompson]

Colin Gunton is to be congratulated on a new edition of his first book *Becoming and Being* which dealt largely with a comparison between Charles Hartshorne's Neo-Classical theism and the earlier sections of Karl Barth's *Church Dogmatics* on the Trinity, the

Being of God in Freedom and Love. In an Epilogue to the new edition Gunton points out that much has changed since he began to write his book — namely, the rise of Process thought, the lessening of the influence of Bultmann and Brunner and the 'Honest to God' debate of J.A.T. Robinson. Critique of these meant for the writer at the time, a welcome acceptance of Barth's earlier Trinitarian approach. Since then it has, however, meant that this continued acceptance of the substance of Barth's attitude requires a more critical approach. This is carried out in a twenty page Epilogue in the new edition which makes some suggestions in three areas.

### 1. *The First Person and the Trinity.*

Gunton believes that part of Barth's early weakness was his support for traditional Western views of individualism which he sought to escape by means of the use of the term 'mode of being'. He now sees that the Cappadocians proposed a way this impasse could be overcome. Ways of being can be seen as almost neutral but the Eastern view emphasises the distinctive particularity and interrelationship of the persons in God. This means that persons are ultimate in God as a concrete threeness and not as abstract beings. The latter view led inevitably to a weakness of emphasis on the particular actions of the Son and Spirit. Barth is right to see the ontological Trinity in terms of the economic but, asks Gunton, does he give a proper view of the economy? This he doubts since the threefoldness as modes of being in Barth tends to a too impersonal view. However, Barth does move away from this kind of monism towards the East in C.D. 111/2 and was certainly no modalist.

### 2. *The Holy Spirit*

Barth's emphasis on the Holy Spirit is based on the Western view of Augustine and is given a too limited role as the union of Father and Son and as coming from the Son. The unity of God should consist in the way the three persons are from and to one another. Gunton feels there is an absence of reciprocal relations between Son and Spirit in Barth and an occlusion of the Spirit. The result is a rather impersonal tendency though this was not Barth's intention. The emphasis should be on the priority of the persons. The Trinity is a *koinonia* of persons. We require, therefore, an Eastern movement

outwards from God rather than a Western movement inwards. Barth's anthropology in **C.D.** 111/2 points in this direction but even more does the doctrine of reconciliation - a point Gunton has failed to make. There Barth sees the Father and the Son particularly related to salvation. The Spirit is also involved since he is the Spirit of Christ is divine and is also referred to as the Spirit of God or of the Lord or of the Father. In fact there is no lessening of the Spirit's role in relation to the Father and the Son.

Barth accepts the Western *Filioque* and sees the Spirit as the bond of love between Father and Son but also equally Lord and so divine. At the same time he also sees the Spirit in a context of salvation, of worship and doxology, a position which comes close to that of the Orthodox. Thus the change Gunton requires is already implicit in Barth's view of man, of atonement and of eschatology — a move away from a more static view to an active, dynamic relational one.

The last section deals with Barth's view of the suffering of God on the Cross — the God-forsakenness of the Son yet the oneness of the Father and the Holy Spirit in these acts. It is scarcely correct to say that Barth failed to give the weight to the humanity of Christ which is necessary if the distinction between God's suffering and that focused on Christ is to be made. Barth, however, speaks of both. The suffering of Jesus Christ on the Cross as Son of God and so divine and the fellow suffering of the Father with the Son in the power of the Spirit is clearly underlined by Barth. It is in this wholly real way that we come to know who God is as one yet three in one in Himself and in the economy of salvation. Gunton closes his remarks by stating "None of the points made against Barth in this Epilogue could have been made without him for he is the pioneer of a way of doing theology whose day has still not yet fully come." (245).

John Thompson